arXiv:1211.1392v1 [hep-th] 6 Nov 2012

Chiral Symmetry Breaking, Deconfinement and Entanglement Monotonicity

Tarun Grover[1]

[1]*Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA*

We employ the recently conjectured generalization of the c-theorem to 2+1-d to derive non-perturbative results for several strongly interacting field theories. In particular, by demanding that the universal constant part of the entanglement entropy decreases along the renormalization group flow, we find an upper bound $N_f \approx 3.3$ on the number of (four-component) flavors below which the non-compact QED-3 undergoes chiral symmetry breaking. Similar arguments imply that the compact QED-3 is always deconfining when $N_f > 3.6$. We generalize these results to QCD-3 as well. Furthermore, we derive strong constraints imposed by entanglement monotonicity on the nature of quantum phase transitions in condensed matter systems with "topological order".

PACS numbers:

Strongly interacting field-theories in 2+1-d often arise as a low-energy description of condensed matter systems and also serve as a test-bed for phenomena in 3+1-d. Generally speaking, there are only a few exact results for non-supersymmetric strongly correlated systems in greater than two space-time dimensions. Thus, it is natural to ask whether there exist non-perturbative principles that may not provide solution to particular problems but still help constrain the set of possibilities for a generic problem? An example is the central charge theorem[1] for two dimensional conformal field theories and its four dimensional version, the a-theorem[2–4], that strongly constrain the renormalization group flow of conformal field theories. In this short note, we employ the recently proposed generalizations of the central charge theorem to 2+1-d[5–11], supplemented with the work of Vafa and Witten[12], to derive the low-energy behavior of several strongly interacting 2+1-d theories. In particular, we put an upper bound on the critical number of fermions below which the chiral symmetry breaking occurs in a non-compact QED-3, and an upper bound on the number of fermion flavors required to deconfine fermions in compact QED-3. We also derive similar results for QCD-3 for any non-abelian gauge group. Furthermore, we derive strong constraints imposed by the entanglement monotonicity on the nature of quantum and classical phase transitions[13] in theories that involve gauge fields[14–19].

Let us recall the central-charge theorem[1], or, the "c-theorem", that has been quite fruitful in detailing the phase diagrams of several 1+1-d systems that have conformally invariant fixed points. The c-theorem states that the central charge c of a conformal field theory (CFT) decreases along the renormalization group flow, as one goes from a UV fixed point to an IR fixed point. As an example, a relevant perturbation to the tricritical Ising point ($c = 7/10$) can take it to only two possible unitary CFTs: the Ising critical point ($c = 1/2$) or a fully gapped system ($c = 0$). There is a similar theorem for four dimensional CFTs, namely Cardy's a-theorem[2,3] that has been put on rigorous footing[4] in the recent past.

Recently, there has been some progress in generalizing the c-theorem to three space-time dimensions[5–11]. Specifically, Refs.[5–7] have argued that for Lorentz invariant theories, if one writes the entanglement entropy for a circular region of radius R as $S(R) = \alpha R - \gamma$, the universal constant γ decreases along the RG flow. A second development has been the conjecture that the universal part "F" of the free energy of a CFT on a three-sphere S^3 decreases along the RG flow and takes a stationary value F_0 at the fixed points[8,9]. Ref.[11] showed that for conformally invariant systems, these two seemingly different proposals are equivalent with $\gamma = F_0$ at the fixed points. Below, we will use the entanglement entropy formulation of Refs.[5–7] when thinking about 2+1-d quantum systems, and the F-theorem formulation of Refs.[8,9] when working with classical field theories in 3+0 dimensions.

I. CONSEQUENCES OF ENTANGLEMENT MONOTONICITY FOR QED-3 AND QCD-3

A. Critical Number of Flavors for Chiral Symmetry Breaking in Non-Compact QED-3

Dynamical symmetry breaking is a phenomenon shared by many strongly coupled field theories. In this section, we consider spontaneous generation of chiral mass in non-compact QED-3[12,20]. The theory is given by:

$$\mathcal{L}_{QED-3} = \sum_{a=1}^{N_f} \overline{\psi}_a \left[-i\gamma_\mu \left(\partial_\mu + i a_\mu\right)\right] \psi_a + \frac{1}{2g^2} F_{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu} \tag{1}$$

where ψ is a *four component* Dirac fermion and a_μ is a non-compact $U(1)$ gauge field. The four-component notation help defines chiral symmetry in 2+1-d. Organizing ψ as two two-component spinors, $\psi = [\psi_\uparrow \ \psi_\downarrow]^T$, and choosing $\gamma_0 = \sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_3, \gamma_1 = i\sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_1, \gamma_2 = i\sigma_3 \otimes \sigma_2$, the chiral mass is given by $\Delta\mathcal{L} = m\overline{\psi}\psi = \psi_\uparrow^\dagger \sigma_3 \psi_\uparrow - \psi_\downarrow^\dagger \sigma_3 \psi_\downarrow$. Such a mass breaks the global $U(2N_f)$ symmetry of the above action down to $SU(N_f) \times SU(N_f) \times U(1) \times U(1)$ while preserving the parity and time-reversal. Thus, when generated spontaneously, it leads to $2N_f^2$ number of Goldstone modes. Following Vafa and Witten[12], this is the most likely form of spontaneous symmetry breaking pattern for QED-3, an expectation that is also supported by various other analyses[20].

It is generally believed that the Lagrangian in Eqn.1 undergoes dynamical chiral symmetry breaking (CSB) only for $N_f < N_{fc,CSB}$ where the precise value of $N_{fc,CSB}$ has been a point of vast discussion[20,21]. As we now argue, monotonicity of the entanglement entropy between RG fixed points implies that there indeed exists a critical $N_{fc,CSB}$ above which there is no CSB and furthermore, one can obtain an upper bound on $N_{fc,CSB}$, which we denote by $N^U_{fc,CSB}$ below. Our argument is similar in spirit to those presented by Appelquist et al[22] where it was suggested that the thermodynamic free energy density may serve as an analog of the central charge in three dimensions. However, there are known counterexamples to the monotonicity of free energy density[8,23,24] and therefore it cannot be trusted for obtaining any such bounds.

CSB in a non-compact QED-3 can be thought of as a weak-coupling instability of a UV fixed point consisting of N_f four-component free Dirac fermions and a free photon to an IR fixed point consisting of $2N_f^2$ Goldstone modes and a free photon. The universal part of the entanglement entropy for a free Dirac fermion equals $\gamma_{Dirac} = 0.219$. The assignment of γ to the free photons as well as the Goldstone modes require a bit more thought since a free photon in three-dimensions is not conformally invariant[25]. Indeed, when put on a sphere S^3 of size R, this lack of conformal invariance leads to a logarithmic dependence of its free energy[10] on R . Since a Goldstone mode is dual to a free photon in three dimensions[26], one again expects logarithmic corrections to its entanglement entropy[27]. For our purposes it would be useful to assign an infinitesimal mass δm to the Goldstone mode, such that $\delta m \ll l^{-1}$ where l is the size of the region for which the entanglement is being calculated. This assignment of mass is not merely a mathematical convenience; physically, the phenomena of symmetry breaking is best understood by applying a vanishing small magnetic field that couples to the order-parameter field, and only then taking the thermodynamic limit. The mass δm plays the role of this infinitesimal magnetic field in our discussion. The main implication of this small mass is that it effectively converts a Goldstone mode to a non-compact free scalar, which has a γ-value of $\gamma_{scalar} = 0.0638$ (Ref.[28]) as $l\delta m \to 0$. The photon can be dealt in the same way. In this case, the mass δm corresponds to the inverse of the confinement length for the photon, as one can readily see by dualizing the photon to a Goldstone mode. Hence, it can also be assigned the γ value of a free scalar, though we will not need this precise value in this subsection. The Dirac fermion in the UV is unaffected by infinitesimal δm or the large confinement length and continues to contribute universal entanglement γ_{Dirac} at the UV fixed point.

Let us therefore consider the Lagrangian in Eqn.1 and assume that it undergoes spontaneous CSB, leading to the generation of the chiral mass term and $2N_f^2$ Goldstone modes. The value of γ at the UV fixed point is given by

$$\gamma_{UV} \;=\; 2N_f\gamma_{Dirac} + \gamma_{photon} \tag{2}$$

While in the CSB phase, it is given by

$$\gamma_{IR} \;=\; 2N_f^2\gamma_{scalar} + \gamma_{photon} \tag{3}$$

Using the conjectured montonicity of γ under RG flow[5–7], $\gamma_{UV} > \gamma_{IR}$ and thus, for CSB to occur, one requires

$$\begin{aligned} N_{fc,CSB} &< \frac{\gamma_{Dirac}}{\gamma_{scalar}} \\ &= 3.3056 \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Therefore, $N^U_{fc,CSB} = 4$, that is, the compact QED-3 with four or greater number of four-component flavors (i.e. eight flavors of two-component flavors) is always in the chirally symmetric phase. In the two-component notation, this corresponds to eight flavors of Dirac fermions. We note that the estimates for $N_{fc,CSB}$ (in four-component notation) based on various approximate techniques and lattice-QED studies range from 1.5 to 4[20,21].

B. Critical Number of Flavors for Deconfinement in Compact QED-3

The Lagrangian for compact QED-3 is same as Eqn.1, the only difference being that the instantons in the gauge field configuration are now allowed. Following Polyakov[29], in the absence of any matter field, compact QED-3 confines. However, one expects that the compact QED-3 with N_f (four-component) flavors deconfines for $N_f \gg 1$[30] where the precise value of the critical number $N_{fc,Dec}$ required for deconfinement is not known. Below, we show that the arguments similar to the previous subsection, when supplemented with the work of Witten and Vafa in Ref.[12], implies that one always obtains deconfinement when $N_f \geq 4$ (we remind the reader that this corresponds to eight flavors in the two-component notation).

So let us start with compact QED-3 in the UV with massless photons and N_f massless fermions. One can imagine four distinct possibilities for the fate of this theory in the IR:

I The theory confines with a mass gap to all excitations.

II The theory confines while breaking the flavor symmetry $SU(2N_f)$ down to some smaller subgroup resulting in massless Goldstone bosons.

- III The theory deconfines with massless fermions in the IR[31].
- IV The theory deconfines while maintaining gap to the fermions and gauge fields in the IR.[31].

In a remarkable paper, Vafa and Witten[12] argued that in 2+1-d, whenever there exist $N_f > 3$ massless fermions coupled to massless gauge bosons in the UV, then there necessarily exist massless particles in the IR. Thus, for $N_f > 3$, the possibilities I and IV are ruled out. We now show that when $N_f \geq 4$, the possibility II is also ruled out. To see this, note that the universal part of the entanglement entropy in the UV is given by $2N_f\gamma_{Dirac} + \gamma_{photon}$. We again assign the photon a large confinement length in the UV which is taken to infinity at the end of the calculation for entanglement entropy. Thus, it behaves exactly like a Goldstone mode in the previous subsection with $\gamma_{photon} = \gamma_{scalar}$. Assuming that the pattern of flavor symmetry breaking is[12,20] $U(2N_f) \rightarrow U(N_f) \times U(N_f)$, this leads to $2N_f^2$ Goldstone modes in the IR. In contrast to the discussion in the last subsection, the photon does not survive after symmetry breaking since we are dealing with a compact QED. The monotonicity of entanglement entropy implies that the symmetry breaking is possible only if $2N_f\gamma_{Dirac} + \gamma_{photon} > 2N_f^2\gamma_{Goldstone}$, that is, $N_f < 3.58$. Therefore, when $N_f \geq N^U_{fc,Dec} = 4$ (which equals eight flavors in two-component notation), one should obtain deconfinement in the IR with gapless fermions, since all the other known possibilities are ruled out.

C. Critical Number of Flavors for Chiral Symmetry Breaking and Deconfinement in QCD-3

The argument in the previous subsection may be generalized to QCD-3. Consider the theory of N_f flavors of four-component Dirac fermions coupled to a non-abelian gauge field whose elements lie in a group G :

$$\mathcal{L}_{QCD-3} = \sum_{a=1}^{N_f} \overline{\psi}_a \left[-i\gamma_\mu\left(\partial_\mu - igA^i_\mu T^i\right)\right]\psi_a + \mathrm{Tr}\left(F_{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}\right) \tag{5}$$

Above, T^i are the generators for the gauge group G. We consider three gauge groups G: $SU(N_c), O(N_c)$ and $SP(N_c)$ with fermions possessing the global symmetry $U(2N_f), O(4N_f)$ and $SP(2N_f)$ respectively.

The first question we ask is: what is the critical value of N_{fc} below which the above described chiral symmetry is spontaneously broken? Following the same argument as in the subsection IA, an upper bound N^U_{fc} on N_{fc} can again be obtained using entanglement monotonicity: above certain N_f, the number of Goldstone modes generated due to chiral symmetry breaking will be too large to satisfy the entanglement monotonicity. A derivation similar to the previous two subsections imply that for chiral symmetry breaking to be possible, the following condition must be satisfied:

$$2N_f d(G)\gamma_{Dirac} + r(G)\gamma_{scalar} > N_{Goldstone}\gamma_{scalar} \tag{6}$$

where $d(G)$ is the dimension of the representation of the group G under which fermions transform, $r(G)$ is the number of generators of G and $N_{Goldstone}$ is the number of Goldstone modes generated due to chiral symmetry breaking. $N_{Goldstone}$ depends on the patter on symmetry breaking and will generally scale as N_f^2 leading to a finite upper bound N^U_{fc}.

As a concrete example, consider fermions transforming in the vector representation of the group G. Furthermore, taking cue from Vafa-Witten theorem[12], as well analyses in Refs.[32,33], let us assume that the chiral symmetry breaking pattern is "symmetric", that is, $SU(2N_f) \rightarrow SU(N_f) \times SU(N_f), O(4N_f) \rightarrow O(2N_f) \times O(2N_f)$ and $SP(2N_f) \rightarrow SP(N_f) \times SP(N_f)$. This leads to the following constraints on N_{fc}

$$\underline{G = SU(N_c)}:$$
$$2N_{fc}N_c\gamma_{Dirac} + (N_c^2 - 1)\gamma_{scalar} > 2N_{fc}^2\gamma_{scalar}$$

$$\underline{G = O(N_c)}:$$
$$2N_{fc}N_c\gamma_{Dirac} + \frac{1}{2}N_c(N_c - 1)\gamma_{scalar} > 4N_{fc}^2\gamma_{scalar}$$

$$\underline{G = SP(N_c)}:$$
$$2N_{fc}N_c\gamma_{Dirac} + \frac{1}{2}N_c(N_c + 1)\gamma_{scalar} > N_{fc}^2\gamma_{scalar}$$

These equations can be readily solved to find the flavor number $N^U_{fc,CSB}$ above which one always expects a chirally symmetric phase. Rather than writing down the closed-form solution to the above simple equations, we simply note that when $N_c \gtrsim N_f$, chiral symmetry breaking cannot occur and in the limit $N_f \gg N_c$, $N^U_{fc,CSB}$ is given by $N^U_{fc,CSB} \approx \frac{N_c\gamma_{Dirac}}{\gamma_{scalar}}$. This is consistent with the intuition that greater the N_c, larger is the value of N_{fc}, akin to the celebrated result for 3+1-d QCD[34], and also consistent with the approximate analysis of Ref.[32] for 2+1-d.

Similar to the analysis in the last section, Vafa-Witten argument[12] may again be used to relate $N^U_{fc,CSB}$ to an upper bound $N^U_{fc,dec}$ on the critical number of flavors required for *deconfinement* in the IR. There is one subtlety however. If N_c is odd, even if there is no symmetry breaking, one can imagine a confined phase where the quarks are bound together to form a fermionic baryon. For N_c even, such a possibility does not exist[35]. For this case, $N^U_{fc,dec}$ is given by $N^U_{fc,dec} = \mathrm{Max}\left(4, N^U_{fc,CSB}\right)$ where

'Max(a, b)' denotes the maximum of the two numbers a and b. This is because there exist gapless particles in the spectrum when $N_f \geq 4$ and for $N_f \geq N^U_{fc,CSB}$, as we just argued, they cannot be Goldstone modes.

Large-N_f perspective : We would like to end this section with a slightly different perspective. In the above treatment, we treated CSB as the instability of a UV fixed point consisting of free fermions and free photon/gluons. Furthermore, we equated the γ value for a free photon/gluon to that of a free scalar by providing a large confinement length to the photon, so that one can use the result for a non-compact scalar. For the sake of completeness, we now provide a slightly different (and weaker) argument that does not require perturbing around the free fixed point but still leads to essentially the same results.

When $N_f \gg 1$, QED-3 as well QCD-3 flow is known to be described by an interacting conformally invariant fixed point in the IR. As N_f decreases, at some point there may be possibility of CSB to a Goldstone mode phase, and we are interested in putting a bound N^U_{fc} on N_f above which this is ruled out. This bound may be obtained by comparing the entanglement γ of the interacting QED-3/QCD-3 with that of the Goldstone mode phase. Of course, since QED-3/QCD-3 is an interacting theory, one does not know the exact γ for these theories, but one can calculate it in a $1/N_f$ expansion[10]. As the reader might anticipate, to the leading order in N_f, the γ value of the interacting QED-3/QCD-3 is given simply by the value of γ at the aforementioned UV fixed point[10], i.e. $\gamma_{QED-3} = 2N_f N_c \gamma_{Dirac} + O(1/N)$ where $N_c = 1$ for QED-3. The γ value for the Goldstone mode phase remains unchanged from the previous discussion and scales as N_f^2. Therefore, if γ is indeed monotonic between two fixed points of RG, one concludes that the scaling $\gamma \propto N_f$ at the interacting fixed point as compared to $\gamma \propto N_f^2$ at the Goldstone mode fixed point, implies that there indeed exist a finite N^U_{fc}. Furthermore, its value exactly matches the value calculated in the previous subsection to the leading order in N^U_{fc}. Since, in the two component irreducible representation, we find $N^U_{fc} \approx 8$ for QED-3 as well as $SU(N)$ QCD-3, the corrections to this number are expected to be small, which is confirmed by the non-perturbative arguments in the previous subsections.

II. DECONFINED VS CONVENTIONAL CRITICAL POINTS

Deconfined quantum critical points: In this section, we will consider a few applications of entanglement monotonicity to interacting spins and/or gauge fields on lattices in 2+1-d and 3+0-d.

Let us start by posing the following question: for an $SU(2)$ symmetric spin-system in 2+1-d, can there ever be a quantum phase transition out of a gapped paramagnet that carries one spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ spin per unit cell, such that the transition lies in the conventional $O(3)$ universality class?

Before attempting to answer the above question, it is perhaps important to understand the backdrop. In 3+0-d classical statistical mechanics, the phase transition between an ordered $O(N)$ magnet and a disordered phase (i.e. a paramagnet) generically lies in the $O(N)$ universality class. However, quantum mechanical spins carry non-trivial Berry's phase which may not only lead to a dramatic change in the nature of the magnetic phase transition[16,17,45], but perhaps even more strikingly, they can sometimes disallow the existence of a featureless gapped paramagnet altogether[36,37]. In particular, Hastings[37] showed that a paramagnet with an odd number of spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ spins in the unit cell has a robust ground state degeneracy on the torus. The non-uniqueness of the ground state is related to the fact that the low-energy theory is a topological quantum field theory and the resulting paramagnet is a "topologically ordered" state[38]. Thus, the aforementioned question may be reformulated as: for an $SU(2)$ symmetric spin-system in 2+1-d, can there ever be a quantum phase transition out of a topologically ordered paramagnet, such that the transition lies in the conventional $O(3)$ universality class?

A topological ordered paramagnet has a non-zero universal entanglement[46,47], γ_{topo}. This fact, when supplemented with entanglement montonicity puts a strong constraint on the universality class of the aforementioned transition. One can obtain an upper bound on the γ value for the conventional $O(3)$ critical point by flowing down to it from the Gaussian fixed point. The Gaussian point consists of three free scalars and therefore,

$$\gamma_{O(3)} < 3 \times 0.0638 \tag{7}$$

If the critical point flows to a topologically ordered paramagnet on one side of the phase diagram, then the $\gamma_{critical}$ corresponding to the phase transition point must satisfy:

$$\gamma_{critical} > \gamma_{topo} \tag{8}$$

The γ_{topo}, on the other hand, can only take a discrete set of values, since it is related to the quantum numbers of the excitations that lie above the ground state[46,47]. The smallest possible value of γ_{topo} is attained by the Laughlin $\nu = 1/2$ state with $\gamma_{topo} = \log(\sqrt{2}) \approx 0.3466$. Clearly, this is greater than the upper bound for $\gamma_{O(3)}$. Therefore, we conclude that *such a transition is not allowed to lie in the $O(3)$ universality class , even though the global symmetry is just $SU(2)$*. Indeed, all the known transitions between the ordered phases and the topologically ordered phases have fractional particles even at the transition which leads to a different value of $\gamma_{critical}$ such that the equation $\gamma_{critical} > \gamma_{topo}$ is always satisfied[10,18,19] where γ_{topo} is the value for the topologically ordered phase. We note that there already exist several realistic models of frustrated magnets[39–42], which seemingly exhibit a direct phase transition between a topologically ordered paramagnet and an $SU(2)$ symmetry broken state.

Similar analysis can be done for phase transitions in bosonic systems that have a global $U(1)$ symmetry corresponding to boson number conservation. For example, the phase transition between a superfluid and a $\nu = 1/2$ fractional quantum Hall state of bosons can not be a conventional O(2) transition because $\gamma_{O(2)} < 2 \times 0.0638$ while $\gamma_{\nu=1/2} = \log(\sqrt{2}) \approx 0.3466$. This is indeed consistent with the known theory for this transition[43]. On the other hand, the phase transition between an integer quantum Hall state of bosons and a superfluid is allowed to be in the $O(2)$ universality class, since the integer quantum Hall state has $\gamma = 0$. Indeed, the critical theory for such a transition is just O(2)[44].

Transitions in classical gauge-matter theories: The same argument as above also applies to classical finite temperature transitions in gauge-matter theories in 3+0 dimensions. For example, consider classical $\mathbb{Z}_2$ gauge-matter at finite temperature on a three-dimensional cubic lattice[48]:

$$Z = \sum_{\{\sigma\},\{s\}} e^{-H(\{\sigma\},\{s\})} \tag{9}$$

where

$$H(\{\sigma\},\{s\}) = -J \sum_{<i,j>} s_i \sigma_{ij} s_j - K \sum_{\square} \prod_{\square} \sigma \tag{10}$$

This phase diagram of this model is well-understood[48]. The easiest way to establish this phase diagram is to first consider the limit $J = 0$ in which case one obtains a pure gauge theory which is separated from the confined phase via a second-order transition. Similarly, in the limit $K = \infty$, the deconfined phase is separated from the Higgs phase by a second-order transition. As shown in Ref.[48], the Higgs and the confined phase are one and the same.

The main point that we want to emphasize here is that though both the aforementioned transitions are generally assumed to be in the Ising universality class, in a strict sense, this is not true. The free energy F on S^3 for the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ deconfined phase is log(2) (Ref.[49]), while the F for a conventional Ising critical point is bounded from above by $F_{scalar} = 0.0638$. Indeed, by performing a quantum-to-classical mapping, and using the arguments of Ref.[18], this transition can be argued to consist of critical 2+1-d Ising CFT coexisting with deconfined (quantum) Ising gauge theory. Using the notation of Ref.[50], the transition may thus be called Ising*, and it has the universal $F = F_{\text{Ising}} + \log(2)$ where F_{Ising} is the value for the conventional 3D Ising critical point. It is interesting to note that all local operators will have scaling dimensions identical to that at the Ising transition and yet the transition is in a different universality class since the F value differs.

The distinction between the regular Ising and Ising* may seem 'trivial' in that the CFT with the infinite correlation length (= Ising model) and the TQFT with zero correlation length (= Ising gauge theory) essentially decouple at low-energies. However, presence of topological degrees of freedom at such transitions can have dramatic consequences for the nearby phases as we exemplify now. Consider Kitaev's honeycomb model[51], where in the absence of any magnetic field and uniform couplings one obtains a nodal $\mathbb{Z}_2$ topologically ordered state. At low-energies, such a state shows decoupling between the gapless fermionic degrees of freedom and the gapped Ising gauge theory, very similar to the case of Ising* transition above. Thus, the value of γ for this phase is given by[52] $\gamma_{nodal} = \gamma_{gauge} + \gamma_{fermion} \approx \log(2) + 0.22 \approx 0.91$. Now, this phase is known to be unstable for infinitesimal value of magnetic field in the [111] direction to a topological ordered phase with anyons that obey non-abelian statistics[51] which happens to have a $\gamma = \log(2)$. Such an RG flow from the gapless state to the gapped topological ordered state would be prohibited due to the entanglement monotonicity, if it were not for the presence of gapped $\mathbb{Z}_2$ gauge sector in the gapless phase. This is because, the fermions alone carry $\gamma_{fermion} \approx 0.22$, too little to allow a direct flow to the non-abelian state with $\gamma = \log(2)$.

III. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In this note, we employed the recently conjectured generalization of the c-theorem to odd space-time dimensions[5–11] to derive an upper bound $N_f \approx 3.3$ on the critical number of four-component flavors below which non-compact QED-3 undergoes chiral symmetry breaking. We also obtained an upper bound $N_f \approx 3.6$ on the number of four-component flavors required to make a compact QED-3 deconfining in the IR. We also generalized both of these results to QCD-3 for arbitrary gauge groups. Furthermore, again using the monotonicity of entanglement entropy, we showed that the transitions to topologically ordered paramagnets in an $SU(2)$ symmetric spin-system can never lie in an $O(3)$ universality class. We also pointed out that there exist classical phase transitions where correlation functions of all local operators are identical to that of an Ising transition, yet the critical point does not lie in the conventional Ising universality class.

Apart from being of general field-theoretic interest, our results have obvious implications for several physical systems. QED-3 and QCD-3 is the putative low-energy theory of the so-called "algebraic spin-liquids" that arise in the context of frustrated magnets. One of the central questions in the spin-liquid theory is: When are spin-liquids stable to the confinement? Though one expects deconfinement for $N_f \gg 1$, a precise value of N_{fc} above which one obtains deconfinement has been lacking[30]. For example, Ref.[54] proposed an algebraic spin-liquid on the kagome lattice whose low-energy theory corresponds to QED-3 with eight two-component flavors. Similarly, Ref.[53] studied a square lattice model using Quantum Monte Carlo where the author found evidence for the deconfined phase of QED-3 with eight two-component flavors. Similar spin-liquids with eight or more two-component flavors were also discussed in Ref.[55] where a $1/N$ perturbative RG analysis was performed to determine the instabilities of algebraic spin-liquids. Our non-perturbative results imply that all of these putative spin-liquids are indeed stable against confinement.

A different question that is also relevant to the spin-liquid theory is: when is confinement accompanied by spontaneous breaking of chiral symmetry? This question may be answered using the results of Ref.[12]. If the number of four-component flavors $N_f \geq 4$ and one undergoes a confinement transition out of an algebraic spin-liquid, then it is necessarily accompanied by Goldstone modes since the spectrum must have gapless particles[12].

Admittably, even thought our method provides non-perturbative bounds on CSB and deconfinement, it does not provide any direct insight into the mechanism for either of these phenomenon. We hope that a better understanding of entanglement monotonicity might lead to progress in this direction. We should also mention that though there now exist many non-trivial tests in support for the monotonicity of entanglement or the free energy between on S^3 (see e.g. Ref.[56,57]), as well as general arguments in favor of it[5–9,11], a rigorous proof is still lacking. In these respects, it might be interesting to explore the connection between the entanglement monotonicity, and the thinning of IR degrees of freedom via wave-function renormalization approach introduced in Ref.[58].

Finally, we mention that it will be worthwhile to find and study examples, perhaps in 2+1-d supersymmetric field theories, where the precise value of the number of flavors required for chiral symmetry breaking transition is known, so that the methodology presented in this note can be verified.

Acknowledgments: I thank L. Balents, J. Polchinski, and especially, N. Iqbal, V. Kumar and M. Metlistski for several stimulating and helpful discussions; I also thank M. Hermele, T. Senthil and A. Vishwanath for useful feedback on the draft and I. Klebanov, S. Sachdev and C. Vafa for helpful email exchanges. I thank organizers and participants of the KITP program "Frustrated Magnetism and Quantum Spin Liquids". This research was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. NSF PHY11-25915.

---

[1] A. B. Zamolodchikov, JETP Lett. 43, 730 (1986) [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 43, 565 (1986)].

[2] J. L. Cardy, Phys.Lett. B 215, 749 (1988).

[3] H. Osborn, Phys. Lett. B 222, 97 (1989); I. Jack, H. Osborn, Nucl. Phys. B 343, 647-688 (1990).

[4] Z. Komargodski, A. Schwimmer, JHEP 1112, 099 (2011).

[5] R. C. Myers and A. Sinha, JHEP 1101, 125 (2011); R. C. Myers and A. Sinha, Phys. Rev. D 82, 046006 (2010).

[6] H. Casini and M. Huerta, J. Phys. A, A 40, 7031 (2007).

[7] H. Casini, Marina Huerta, arXiv:1202.5650.

[8] D. L. Jafferis, I. R. Klebanov, S. S. Pufu and B. R. Safdi, JHEP 1106, 102 (2011).

[9] I. R. Klebanov, S. S. Pufu and B. R. Safdi, JHEP 1110, 038 (2011) ; A. Amariti and M. Siani, JHEP 1110, 016 (2011); A. Amariti and M. Siani, JHEP 1111, 056 (2011) ; D. R. Gulotta, C. P. Herzog and S. S. Pufu, JHEP 1112, 077 (2011).

[10] I. R. Klebanov, S. S. Pufu, S. Sachdev and B. R. Safdi, arXiv:1112.5342.

[11] H. Casini, M. Huerta and R. C. Myers, JHEP 1105, 036 (2011).

[12] C. Vafa and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B 234, 173 (1984); Comm. Math. Phys. 95, 257 (1984).

[13] Subir Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions*, Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[14] W. Chen, M. P. A. Fisher, and Y.-S. Wu, Phys. Rev. B 48, 13749 (1993).

[15] A.V. Chubukov, T. Senthil and S. Sachdev, Physical Review Letters 72, 2089 (1994).

[16] T. Senthil, A. Vishwanath, L. Balents, S. Sachdev, and M. P. A. Fisher, Science 303, 1490 (2004); T. Senthil, Leon Balents, Subir Sachdev, Ashvin Vishwanath, Matthew P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B 70, 144407 (2004).

[17] Leon Balents, Lorenz Bartosch, Anton Burkov, Subir Sachdev, Krishnendu Sengupta, Phys. Rev. B 71, 144508 (2005).

[18] B. Swingle and T. Senthil, Phys. Rev. B 86, 155131 (2012).

[19] B. Swingle, arXiv:1209.0769.

[20] R. Pisarski, Phys. Rev. D29, 2423 (1984); T. Appelquist, M. Bowick, D. Karabali, and L.C.R. Wijewardhana, Phys. Rev. D 33, 3704 (1986); T. Appelquist, D. Nash and L.C.R. Wijewardhana, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 2575 (1988).

[21] P. Maris, Phys. Rev. D 54, 4049 (1996); D. Nash, Phys. Rev. Lett. 62, 3024 (1989) ; K.-I. Kondo, T. Ebihara, T. Iizuka, E. Tanaka, Nucl. Phys. B 434, 85 (1995) ; I.J.R. Aitchison, N.E. Mavromatos, D.O. McNeill, Phys. Lett. B 402, 154 (1997) ; C.S. Fischer, R. Alkofer, T. Dahm, and P. Maris, Phys. Rev. D 70, 073007 (2005); M. Franz, T. Pereg-Barnea, D. E. Sheehy, Z. Tesanovic, Phys. Rev. B 68, 024508 (2003) ; A. Bashir and A. Raya, Few Body Syst. 41, 185 (2007) ; Costas Strouthos, John B. Kogut J.Phys.Conf.Ser.150:052247 (2009).

[22] T. Appelquist, A. G. Cohen and M. Schmaltz, Phys. Rev. D 60, 045003 (1999).

[23] S. Sachdev, Phys. Lett. B 309, 285 (1993); A. V. Chubukov, S. Sachdev, and J. Ye, Phys. Rev. B 49, 11919 (1994).

[24] The thermodynamic free energy density in the proposal in Ref.[22] should not be confused with the universal part of the free energy on S^3 used in Ref.[8]; they are unrelated.

[25] See e.g. S. El-Showk, Y. Nakayama, S. Rychkov, Nuclear Physics B 848, 578 (2011).

[26] See, e.g., A. Zee, *Quantum Field Theory in a Nutshell*, Princeton University Press, 2nd Ed. (2010).

[27] M. A. Metlitski, T. Grover, arXiv:1112.5166v1

[28] J. S. Dowker, arXiv:1012.1548 [hep-th].

[29] A. M. Polyakov, Nucl. Phys. B120, 429 (1977).

[30] Michael Hermele, T. Senthil, Matthew P. A. Fisher, Patrick A. Lee, Naoto Nagaosa, Xiao-Gang Wen, Phys.

Rev. B 70, 214437 (2004).

[31] Deconfinement need not necessarily result in gapless photons in the IR. For example, one may imagine a situation where the gauge field gets broken down to $\mathbb{Z}_2$, and one obtains fermions coupled to a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ gauge field in the IR. As discussed in the main text, these fermions are necessarily gapless if $N_f > 3$ due to arguments in Ref.[12].

[32] T. Appelquist, D. Nash, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 721 (1990).

[33] R. DeJonghe, K. Frey, T. Imbo, arXiv:1207.6547.

[34] D.J. Gross, F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 30, 1343 (1973); H.D. Politzer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 30, 1346 (1973).

[35] We note that this distinction between even and odd N_c is irrelevant for “algebraic spin-liquids” which are quantum spin-systems whose low-energy theory corresponds to QED-3 or QCD-3. This is because in a spin-system, the presence of fermions in the low energy theory necessarily implies deconfinement.

[36] M. Oshikawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 1535 (2000).

[37] M. B. Hastings, Phys. Rev. B 69, 104431 (2004).

[38] Xiao-Gang Wen, *Quantum field theory of many-body systems*, Oxford Graduate Texts, 2004.

[39] Hong-Chen Jiang, Hong Yao, Leon Balents, Phys. Rev. B 86, 024424 (2012).

[40] Ling Wang, Zheng-Cheng Gu, Frank Verstraete, Xiao-Gang Wen, arXiv:1112.3331.

[41] L. Messio, O. Cepas, C. Lhuillier, Phys. Rev. B 81, 064428 (2010).

[42] Z. Y. Meng, T. C. Lang, S. Wessel, F. F. Assaad, and A. Muramatsu, Nature (London) 464, 847 (2010).

[43] M. Barkeshli, John McGreevy, arXiv:1201.4393.

[44] T. Grover, A. Vishwanath, arXiv:1210.0907, Y.-M. Lu, D.-H. Lee, arXiv:1210.0909.

[45] N. Read and S. Sachdev, Physical Review B 42, 4568 (1990); N. Read and S. Sachdev, Physical Review Letters 62, 1694 (1989).

[46] M. Levin and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 110405 (2006).

[47] A. Kitaev and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 110404 (2006).

[48] E. Fradkin and S. H. Shenker, Phys. Rev. D 19, 3682 (1979); J. B. Kogut, Reviews of Modern Physics, 51, 659 (1979).

[49] E. Witten, Comm. Math. Phys. 121, 351 (1989).

[50] T. Senthil, M.P.A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B 62, 7850 (2000).

[51] A. Kitaev, Annals of Physics 321, 2 (2006).

[52] H. Yao, X.-L. Qi, Phys. Rev. Lett., 105, 080501 (2010).

[53] F. F. Assaad, Phys. Rev. B 71, 075103 (2005).

[54] S. Ryu, O. I. Motrunich, J. Alicea, Matthew P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B 75, 184406 (2007).

[55] C. Xu, Phys. Rev. B 78, 054432 (2008).

[56] D. L. Jafferis, JHEP 5, 159 (2012).

[57] A. Kapustin, B. Willett, Itamar Yaakov, JHEP 10, 013 (2010).

[58] Xie Chen, Zheng-Cheng Gu, Xiao-Gang Wen, Phys. Rev. B 82, 155138 (2010).